UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,155	01/04/2001	Frank L. Weil	P5410	3195

32658 7590 04/22/2004

HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
ONE TABOR CENTER, SUITE 1500
1200 SEVENTEEN ST.
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER	
CHEN, CHONGSHAN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2172	17

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/754,155	WEIL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chongshan Chen	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 February 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 4 February 2004, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hendren et al. ("Hendren", International Publication Number: WO 00/51031).

As per claim 1, Hendren teaches a method for controlling access provided to a client to content files during an information search based on a client search profile, comprising:

receiving a search request from a client (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 301, HTTP Request Received);

creating a modified search request by applying a search profile for the client to the received search request (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 303, Inset User Profile in Request); and

routing the modified search request to a search engine having a search engine collections populated from the content files (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 304, Forward Request to HTTP Server);

wherein the applying of the search profile includes adding at least a portion of the search profile to the received search request to specify a set of the search engine collections to be searched by the search engine with the modified search request (Hendren, page 2, "User profile information may be added to the data request ...").

As per claim 2, Hendren teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the creating of the modified search request includes generating the search profile based on stored information pertaining to the client (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 300, Establish User Profile Data).

As per claim 3, Hendren teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the generating includes accessing the stored client information using login information for the client, the login information being collected prior to the receiving of the search request (Hendren, page 3, "Login data ...").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-5 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendren et al. ("Hendren", International Publication Number: WO 00/51031).

As per claim 4, Hendren teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing receiving a set of search results in a format defined by the search engine and including standardizing the set of search results. However, Hendren's search system is used in an Internet environment. It is obvious that the Internet search engine will format the search results into a HTML format, which is the standard format for transmitting and displaying the search results to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive the search results in a format (HTML format) defined by the search engine and including standardizing the set of search results in the search system of Hendren so that the search engine can transmit the search results to the user through Internet and display the search results in a web browser.

Claim 5 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 4.

As per claim 14, Hendren teaches a Web server for controlling access to content files during a network-based information search initiated by a remote client, the Web server being communicatively linked to a search engine with search engine collections and the content files, comprising:

a Web server application in communication with a data communications network configured for communicating with the communications network and for receiving a search request from the remote client (Hendren, Fig. 1); and

add a client search profile to the search request to define select collections in the search engine collections for applying the search request and for routing the processed search request to the search engine (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 303, Insert User profile in Request, page 2).

Hendren does not explicitly disclose a search engine interface. However, an interface is a hardware or software component that connects two or more other components for the purpose of passing information from one to the other (IEEE 100, "The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms"). Clearly, the search system of Hendren has a search engine interface between the client and the search engine so that the user can enter search request to the search engine and the search engine can display the search results to the user.

As per claim 15, Hendren teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 14, and further teaches the Web server is a HTTP Web server configured to support Java™ and the search engine interface comprises a Java™ API (Hendren, page 4, HTTP server).

As per claim 16, Hendren teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 14, except for explicitly disclosing the search engine interface is further adapted parsing a set of search results returned by the search engine in response to the routed search request to generate a standardized set of search results. However, Hendren's search system is used in an Internet environment. It is obvious that the Internet search engine will format the search results into a HTML format, which is the standard format for transmitting and displaying the search results to the user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a standardized set of search results in HTML format in the search system of Hendren so that the search engine can transmit the search results to the user through Internet and display the search results in a web browser.

Claim 17 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 4.

6. Claims 6-13, 18-20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendren et al. ("Hendren", International Publication Number: WO 00/51031) in view of Copperman et al. ("Copperman", 6,711,585).

As per claim 6, Hendren teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing prior to the receiving of the search request, intercepting an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content for the search engine collections and in response, returning to the search engine a modified form of the requested set of information. Copperman teaches prior to the receiving of the search request, intercepting an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content for the search engine collections and in response, returning to the search engine a modified form of the requested set of information (Copperman, col. 16, lines 6-7, col. 31, lines 47-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to populate the search engine with the indexed content prior to receive the search request in the search system of Hendren because it is well known in the art that a search engine typically operates on an index built from the document collection, rather than directly on the documents themselves (Copperman, col. 31, lines 47-54). Searching on the indexed content improves the search speed.

As per claim 7, Hendren teaches a method for restricting direct access to content files by a search engine and a client during an information search initiated by the client and performed by the search engine, comprising:

receiving at the search engine interface a search request from the client (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 301, HTTP Request Received); and

routing the search request to the search engine for use in searching the search engine collections (Hendren, Fig. 3A, Forward Request to HTTP Server).

Hendren does not explicitly disclose positioning a search engine interface between the client and the search engine, wherein the search engine interface is also positioned between the search engine and the content files. However, an interface is a hardware or software component that connects two or more other components for the purpose of passing information from one to the other (IEEE 100, "The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms"). Clearly, a search engine interface is positioned between the client and the search engine so that the user can enter search request to the search engine and the search engine can display the search results to the user. Also, it is clear that an interface must be positioned between the search engine and the set of content file so that the search engine can connect to the set of content file and retrieve data from the content file.

Hendren does not explicitly disclose receiving with the search engine interface an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files; operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files; modifying content in the set of information with the search engine interface; passing the modified set of information to the search engine for use in populating a search engine collections. Copperman teaches receiving with the search engine interface an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files; operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files; modifying content in the set of information with the

search engine interface; passing the modified set of information to the search engine for use in populating a search engine collections (Copperman, col. 16, lines 6-7, col. 31, lines 47-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to populate the search engine with the indexed content in the search system of Hendren because it is well known in the art that a search engine typically operates on an index built from the document collection, rather than directly on the documents themselves (Copperman, col. 31, lines 47-54). Searching on the indexed content improves the search speed.

As per claim 8, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further teach the modifying includes removing metatags from at least a portion of the set of information (Copperman, col. 16, lines 6-7, col. 31, lines 47-54).

As per claim 9, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further teach the modifying includes adding additional information to the set o f information (Copperman, col. 16, lines 6-7, col. 31, lines 47-54).

As per claim 10, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further teach the received search request includes a client search profile defining select collections in the search engine collections for applying the search request (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 302, 303, page 2).

As per claim 11, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, and further teach modifying the search request by operating the search engine interface to add a client search profile to the received search request to identify select ones of the search engine collections for applying the search request (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 302, 303, page 2).

As per claim 12, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 11, and further teach the modifying includes generating the client search profile including retrieving with the search engine interface user information for the client (Hendren, Fig. 3B, page 3).

As per claim 13, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, except for explicitly disclosing the positioning includes constructing an instance of the search engine interface that is configured for communicating with the search engine. However, an interface is a hardware or software component that connects two or more other components for the purpose of passing information from one to the other (IEEE 100, "The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms"). Clearly, an instance of the search engine interface is positioned between the client and the search engine so that the user can enter search request to the search engine and the search engine can display the search results to the user.

Claim 18 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 7.

As per claim 19, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 18, and further teach generate the search profile based on client information (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 300, Establish User Profile Data).

As per claim 20, Hendren and Copperman teach all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 18, and further teach receive a set of search results from the search engine and to parse the set of search results into a standardized set of search results for inclusion in a results page (Hendren, Fig. 1).

As per claim 22, Hendren teaches a method for concurrently restricting direct access to content files by a search engine and a client during an information search initiated by the client and performed by the search engine, comprising:

receiving at the search engine interface a search request from the client (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 302, HTTP Request Received);

modifying the search request to add a particular service identification defined in a client search profile (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 303, Insert User Profile Request);

routing the modified search request to the search engine for use in searching the search engine collections, whereby the search engine compares the particular service identification to the service identifications to select a subset of the search engine collections for use in the searching (Hendren, Fig. 3A, 304, Forward Request to HTTP Server).

Hendren does not explicitly disclose positioning a search engine interface between the client and the search engine, wherein the search engine interface is also positioned between the search engine and the content files. However, an interface is a hardware or software component that connects two or more other components for the purpose of passing information from one to the other (IEEE 100, "The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms"). Clearly, a search engine interface is positioned between the client and the search engine so that the user can enter search request to the search engine and the search engine can display the search results to the user. Also, it is clear that an interface must be positioned between the search engine and the set of content file so that the search engine can connect to the set of content file and retrieve data from the content file.

Hendren does not explicitly disclose receiving with the search engine interface an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files; operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files; modifying the retrieved set of information with the search engine interface to include service identifications; passing the modified set of information to the search engine for use in populating a search engine collections. Copperman teaches receiving with the search engine interface an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files; operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files; modifying the retrieved set of information with the search engine interface to include service identifications; passing the modified set of information to the search engine for use in populating a search engine collections (Copperman, col. 16, lines 6-7, col. 31, lines 47-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to populate the search engine with the indexed content in the search system of Hendren because it is well known in the art that a search engine typically operates on an index built from the document collection, rather than directly on the documents themselves (Copperman, col. 31, lines 47-54). Searching on the indexed content improves the search speed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is 703-305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703)305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

April 15, 2004

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER